

## REMARKS

Basis for new claim 1 may be found in previous claims 1, 19, and 20. Basis for new claim 37 may be found in original claims 1 and 22. Basis for new claims 38-63 may be found in original claims 2, 4, 5, 7-14, 16-20, 23-25, 28, and 30-63 respectively.

In paragraph 1 claim 32 stands rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. The Examiner states there is no antecedent basis for the phrase "said ink jet receiving layer". Claim 32 has been amended to depend on claim 31 and therefore has antecedent basis. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In paragraphs 2 and 3 claims 1, 2, 5-12, 14-19, 24-30, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 USC 102 over the Bourdelais et al. (547) and Bourdelais et al. (109). It is respectfully requested that these rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn as the claims as now submitted correspond to claims indicated by the Examiner in paragraph 6 as allowable. Claim 1 corresponds to previous claim 20 and new claim 37 corresponds to previous claim 22. Both of these claims were indicated as allowable if written in independent form. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn as the independent claims now correspond to claims indicated by the Examiner as allowable.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action claims 1, 2, 5-12, 14-19, 24-30, and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Bourdelais et al. (109). In paragraph 4 of the Office Action claims 1-18, 30, 33, and 36 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Trautweiller et al., Bourdelais et al. (310) or Bourdelais et al. (547) all further in view of International Publication WO 96/12766, Maier et al., and Matthews et al. It is respectfully requested that these rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn as the claims as now submitted correspond to claims indicated by the Examiner, in paragraph 6 of the Office Action, as allowable. Amended claim 1 corresponds to previous claim 20 and new claim 37 corresponds to previous claim 22, both of which were indicated as allowable if written in independent form. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In paragraph 6 claims 20, 22, 23, and 31 stand objected to as depending on rejected claims. The Examiner states they would be allowable if

written in proper independent form. The independent claims 1 and 37 now correspond to claims 20 and 22 respectively written in independent form. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the application be allowed.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 USC 112, 35 USC 102, and 35 USC 103 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that an early Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 26,664

Paul A. Leipold/rgd  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-722-5023  
Facsimile: 585-477-1148